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>> Hello everyone.

Welcome back.

Take a few moments to get settled.

Hi, David.

I'm Anna Ehler.

I put the events together.

It is great to see you all today.

I enjoyed the sessions within the hours.

I enjoyed you taking the time for the panelist and for the audience.

As we're getting close to the lunch time I thank your time and questions.

Despite best of intension we always have more questions than we have time to.

We want to go over the day as tomorrow we will have 30 minutes at the end of the day with all the panelist to continue to talk about all the things that have come up with each of the session.

Q and A is open and the most of the recent.

I want to invite Arash and Mia.

Do you have things that are on your mind and your main take away's from the day.

Arash do we start with you?

>> ARASH HEJAZI: I had the privilege to speak with three great panelists

The key take away's that I got from that session were keywords.

Interdisciplinary and science and practice and public knowledge.

That was the main things and great stories told and how societies are playing a crucial role in addressing the big issues.

As Gabi said the pandemic is not just a problem but the massive society economic problems.

Some questions are too big and cannot be addressed with traditional approach and research and I can talk about this but will hand over to Mia to probably continue this.

>> MIA RICCI: Should I?

Okay, well good.

My session just happened so I still remember.

Lots and lots of take aways.

Our panel is amazing.

I have like a long list of action items.

I think that was a goal.

How do we move from discussing the issues and taking action.

Shawn and Loydie have 50 things that they've done from committees and Webinar's and seminars and leadership training and women anatomy programs and Mark talked about making journals accessible.

And collaborating and funds and Lisa talked about being transparent and lots of good stuff and I think I hope that

Everyone was taking notes.

And actually the slides are available.

You can use that.

I forgot to do one thing because I was so hypnotized by all the people talking.

There is one thing that I wanted to do.

Stephanie can help me with this.

We are going to do a poll to continue with the discussion.

I would like to know if you would be interested in joining smaller discussion groups that Wiley can help facilitate in the future to help us on this effort and join efforts.

Stephanie putting a poll in the screen.

Take a few seconds to let us know that you are interested and say yes and we can do small groups.

I think that is happening, right.

>> ANNA EHLER: It is up now.

>> MIA RICCI: It is.

Okay.

Before I can get up to David, Jesse and the co‑moderator Jesse Wiley.

>> JESSE WILEY: The need for inter disciplinary science.

Good science is inclusive and inter disciplinary there is a connection and inclusive science is good science and I this that does mean that inter disciplinary is something that popped up.

>> MIA RICCI: Definitely.

David, any thoughts from this morning?

>> DAVID NICHOLSON: I just wanted to say that I appreciate doing this on Zooms or teams as a constant for many of us in our working lives now.

It leads to a certain amount of a feeling.

Everybody at Wiley appreciates everybody that is attending and the speakers.

They didn't have a choice but we invited them.

The attendees had a choice.

Thank you for turning up.

The other general point to make is I think it is fantastic and humbled by the bright people we work with and what we do.

How proud I am to partner with all of you.

Two things and take away's from Sudip's talk and the later we just had.

In Sudip's talk and sharing of data and DEI and benchmarks look like.

I think that is best practice that emerge there and I hope it does emerge and contribute it to take place.

The second thing was that there was opportunities to do things and take action every day.

I think it came out of Mark's talk and Lisa's session in many journal editor.

Those were my take away's today.

>> MIA RICCI: Thank you all.

I'm going to stop sharing now to see everyone's faces more clearly and move into questions.

So we have actually a number of reflections and questions about interdisciplinary that we can collaborate nor in the association level. How do we communicate in particular with higher ed leaders in funding disciplinary programs even though they may not provide the deep learning

That strive the more focus subject study.

I think I will pose that to the room.

Unmute yourself if you are led to respond.

I know it is a tough one.

Mark

>> DR. MARK RICHARDS: I will you stick my head.

Certainly in the UK I've experienced over the years there have been two sorts of thoughts.

The traditional school of thoughts.

Research should be a fundamental level.

Then you have another school of thoughts that says a lot of the fundamental research has really been done and the real gains is when you start to look at the infer faces of the you have to access the research on the case to case basis.

We have lots of theoretical things that won't go soon.

There is a lot of need for that and a same time I think it is a question of recognizing more specifically

That taking an interdisciplinary approach can lead to newer early gains

In terms of knowledge discovery.

In a sense to be holistic it is almost like if you like a western approach to compartmentalize the advancement of technology that allows

It to happen quicker and faster I think we have an opportunity to start regrouping disciplines in interesting novel ways that can

Lead to an again a new spurt of knowledge discovery.

That is my broad answer but probably haven't answered the question specifically.

I apologize for that

>> ANNA EHLER: I think it is a tough one.

Is it anybody else want to respond?

>> GABI LOMBARDO: From the science policy perspective from the perspective of the funding.

So two aspects.

As you know we have one of the largest funding framework at the European level which is a contribution of 28 to 27 and to be soon member states that put common pot and the

Big frame of program in the rise of 2020 and now the generation of rise of Europe.

It is divided of three pillars.

There is fundamental second pillar to address challenges.

It is a collaborative and the third council within the industry and so on.

It is funding disseminating and dividing the way that everybody has the approach of doing research.

They can contribute and apply for funding.

European funding is only about 5 to 10% in rural investment research in the European level. It is a tiny fraction.

We are doing experiment with the challenges and different types of things.

The fundamental investment is the national level.

You go with very few exceptions.

Less than 50% is invested in projects.

Most of the money at the national level are call funding and co‑grants.

Which means the institution is funding and no matter what research they do.

We are trying to find this division of labor a way to finance research in the most stable possible way.

What is happening in the last ten years we went from this call grants of being 80% of the overall funding for research and national levelling

Gradually reducing their level.

50% grants and 50% prohibits.

This shift has consequences.

One hand is interdisciplinary.

She short lifespan sometimes and increase and increase in funding and have a short span.

The science policy is the answer to this.

We need to find mechanism.

That is why the alliance is really targeting the machine.

What is the machine fund research and get the best results for science.

Thanks.

>> ANNA EHLER: Thank you, Gabi.

David, did you want to respond?

>> DAVID NICHOLSON: A question or follow up question to Gabi and mention the focuses on science policy makers.

What's effective in achieving change there?

Just really curious to get your perspective on that.

>> GABI LOMBARDO: It is a beautiful question.

It is not a single answer, David.

It is most effective the alliance is very young.

When we started we started in the call interdisciplinary.

I thought this is pointless when I got the job.

The reality when you create it and have a voice and are addressing the machine.

We've within addressing the issue with evaluation.

Which are conducive of research in social science humanities.

The challenge of 2020 health and flag for contribution for social science humanities they had 2%

Reviewers.

Result not less than 2% of the projects funding had the component.

When you start unpacking the machine and show very clearly in a very simple way that becomes effective

Especially when you have a critical mask.

We have a voice which is coherent.

From every corner of the place to say this is the problem.

Another thing that we've been effective about it.

Very famous for being cheap.

And many of our colleagues are going around saying give me a computer and I'm sorted.

I don't need a big machine.

We've been taken forward.

The voice of the generation are young researchers saying I need an MRI.

I'm not a psychologist and I need an MRI and I have to go to the

Hospital rent a machine and find the guy.

I do need money, guys.

On the very clear examples really help to get a bit of attention.

The commissioner said be noisy.

We have to be.

>> DAVID NICHOLSON: Yeah, that is excellent Gabi.

That is really fascinating.

Like I said had that phrase of standing up, right.

Don't just say that you are going to support science.

Just really advocate for it.

That makes a lot of sense.

>> ANNA EHLER: Thanks, I want to go to one of the questions that we have in the chat.

This one is for Shawn and Loydie from Jamie.

What are the actual ways that you have championed with the activity with the diversity and inclusion.

Timely that that is what we're all spending so much of our time these days online.

>> SHAWN BOYNES: Loydie do you want to take that one?

>> DR. LOYDIE JEROME-MAJEWSKA: It is to exchange articles to discuss issues that are a raising to our members.

Within each community there is a post board and people can post comments off what is going on in their lives.

We use these ideas to generate Webinar's.

As Shawn said we track what folks are talking about and during our meeting for example, we have discussion about what is going on in different institutions and practices that help others survive

And keeping all of us together in a more physical way.

I hope I answered the question.

My internet is not great.

I think I caught it.

>> SHAWN BOYNES: When people bring forward an interest or need or concern.

We don't try to brush it under the carpet or keep it from the membership at large.

It is about transparency.

We provide them for the platform and let them create the space for themselves.

It is not staff monitored.

It is driven by the membership for the membership.

>> ANNA EHLER: Definitely.

I want to jump back a little bit

To the previous session I know we had questions for the panelist there that we

Did not have a chance to get to.

I will bring Arash back.

>> ARASH HEJAZI: The two sessions are merging very well.

The two concepts.

There ways question from Maria Lepton.

Ties into a lot of other things.

Another question that I have written down using the same words that what is effective in policy making.

That is exactly if I show you, you would laugh.

So Maria's question is why do some countries listen to science better than other countries.

Some governments don't do a good job with you listen to science and some government do a good job and don't listen to science.

Some we see policy makers listening to conspiracy theories an science.

What is the role of societies to act on that and address means?

>> DR. MARK RICHARDS: I have had thoughts on that as well.

Sciences is misleading and it does gives the impression that science happens there and society happens over there and

That societies are not interested in science.

I think part of it is translating research to make it palatable to the broader so when the public has concerns about what may appear to be controversial topics whatever it may be.

There is no source that the public can read and make their opinion and it leaves a gap there for other types of theories to enter and the public are left to

Make that decision by themselves.

I think that journalist can may a much broader role to make the research more palatable for the public.

Doesn't mean just making all accessible but translating the key aspects that perhaps could be discussed in a school classroom or high school teacher that teaches

Science these topics come up and they can be informed for the general public to have these conversations.

I think the journals if you like the societies as the gate keepers if you like of the knowledge, they are in the best position to somehow make it more translatable.

And I think that would reduce some of the sort of conspiracy.

>> ARASH HEJAZI: One of the open sciences is the research for the wider audience.

We talk about the all elements of open science and this needs attention at this point.

>> DR. LOYDIE JEROME-MAJEWSKA: If I could chime in we as scientist and researchers have to take credit with not communicating well with the audiences.

If you look at field we inhibit interdisciplinary we write for either and we have list and we don't use real words anymore.

If you read a journal article from earlier century and currently it is hard to know what the message is.

I think we have to train our students better and ask editors to do better jobs

To make sure that things that are published are more accessible and the journalist can understand and write to translate that better to the society.

Living in Canada we have at same problem.

It is worldwide that scientists are talking to each other and not to our society.

>> STEFANO BERTUZZI: I wanted to add, and I wanted to if I can Zoom out beyond journals I think it is all Thomas Jefferson's fault.

Having read the journal on Hamilton twice and reading the journal six times I'm a little bias.

At least in the US the Jeffersonian is an individual has brought binonsa of success and he also has its limitations.

When it comes for example, infectious diseases which is the pandemic that where the science was tested in communication like never before this is a situation where you know your freedom as much as we want to your individual freedom as much as we want to safeguard it is really not just your responsibility because by definition and infectious agent you compromise other people.

Even the most conservative economist.

Even the most economist would say

Those that think cancer.

You've been smoking your life and you have a lung and it is your problem and the government should not take care of you.

Even when the economist have that few which they talk about infectious diseases is a common good.

Because whatever you do it affects other people who have nothing to do with your decisions.

That is when government intervention is important and the communication and common good comes of value.

I think that the scientific community has been a little up prepared in dealing with this environment.

In whacking people on the head doesn't work.

It is a thorny issue.

I'm seeing it from the US perspective.

I think in many cases the scientist allow me to be critical here in a constructive way.

In some European companies that I follow they have not helped.

You form a circle like and you shoot outside.

Sometimes scientist form a circle and shot each other.

That created such a confusion in the communication that

No one knew what to believe.

So I think it is I'm a diehard optimist.

I think that this difficult experiment that we're put through never before science has been seen germane to people all around the world.

It has been a great testing.

Science and society is not a separate thing.

Science is a part of society.

This is going back to the diversity as long as we culture the elite of the sciences.

Let me explain that is difficult and a bad start to explain something.

You are immediately separating yourself.

Instead being part of it is really approach that we need to take.

It is complicated.

Not that I have an answer.

>> ANNA EHLER: That is good to know.

I want to make sure that we go to Raj and what you were talking about

About what scientist need in way to knowing.

>> RAJ PANDYA: We found a lot of successful communication is reframed from push toward pull.

Rather than telling people what they need to know or what good for them

Asking people what they want to know and need to know.

Projects around flooding.

People would say we want help managing flooding and there might be an agenda around climate change or concern that is relevant.

If that is not where people are that is not where we start.

We start with the question that people have.

As we develop a relationship which is the other piece of this.

People value information from people they know and so knowing scientist and positioning yourself as a member of a community with an expertise to offer

Rather than something outside of the community amplifies this.

I guess pull push and let it be pull driven and not push driven.

>> ANNA EHLER: Knocking people over the head never works.

Who wants to be motivated that way.

It is a hard place to start.

>> RAJ PANDYA: In relationships it never works to tell people what is wrong with them and

>> ANNA EHLER: We are just at time.

Gabi any quick?

>> GABI LOMBARDO: Very quick example.

When I first start working my very first job was working with Tony Gibbons when he was a director.

That is enough let's open the lecture theater as 6:00 o'clock in the evening and we get the best scholars within to talk to people who can come through the door with a free ticket.

Everybody loved and they don't understand what we talk about.

The chief economist and the dean of the economics department won't listen to me and then we did an experiment.

In the first week we have probably ten people turning up in the theater for 500 places.

Within two weeks we have cues of outside university for about an hour before the event started.

It is amazing just open the door of the university with this concept of open campus that is developing now at the moment.

You have an hour a week where Joe sat on the stage and talked about what he knows best.

People do want to know and people do want to learn and are interested.

My experience is really we had a fantastic experience for that. Ask them why are they come.

I went around and say who are you.

I'm the security guard or the banker next door.

I was curious because I heard about this and was curious to learn.

It is not really we kind tend to be a little bit as Stefano was saying we're trying to be people don't understand.

Actually people do and people do want to get closer.

And publishers do have the real role to play because one of the things that I'm doing a little research about how social science and humanities sustain and we use the language

In our articles and they don't appear if you do the search.

Systematically when you publish and start using keywords they will appear.

Simple mathematical word counting.

Sometimes it is all it needs to make a research discoverable.

And tools that we have available online to do search and keywords are important sometimes.

That is what really do help.

>> ANNA EHLER: We can spend a lot more time to talk about this tomorrow.

We're going to talk about open access and ways to welcome more authors into the fold.

Author experience better.

I hope that many of you are able to join us again.

Tomorrow we will go 9:00 A.M. Eastern and running another form with Q & A.

All of the panelist and awesome questions.

Love all the ideas in the room.

It is great to see you all and hope to see you all again tomorrow.

[End @9:34 a.m.]